

REMARKS

Claims 24 and 25 are amended to correct an obvious typographical error resulting in dependency from a cancelled claim.

In the Examiner's Answer the Examiner made a New Ground of Rejection, namely:

Claims 21, 22 and 24-27 are rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Parker in view of Stark, Terrasse and Sherrill et al.

In the New Ground of Rejection, the Examiner states that Parker teaches a woven patterned fabric which includes two different colored yarns woven to form a pattern design on one side and an inverse pattern design on the opposite side. The Examiner also states that Parker teaches having contrasting color borders. This statement is believed to be in error. The Examiner is requested to point out where contrasting color borders are disclosed in Parker et al.

The Examiner states that Parker fails to teach adding a printed design to the pile fabric. The Examiner states that Stark discloses that it is known in the art to add a printed design to a woven pattern to produce a finished product. The Examiner states that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add a printed design disclosed by Stark to the patterned fabric of Parker et al. The Examiner states that Terrasse discloses a woven fabric with a reversible pattern of two different colors consisting of a white color and a blue color. The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art to use the known weave design of Terrasse as the weave design in the woven fabric taught by Parker et al since Parker et al discloses that woven fabrics can comprise two contrasting colored yarns. The Examiner continues stating that while Parker discloses a fabric that is a pile fabric, it fails to teach shearing and blooming of the fabric. The Examiner states that Sherrill et al teaches a cut pile surface that is bloomed to spread out to make the surface more receptive to printing and produce a clear image in the pile. The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to one or ordinary


skill in the art to apply the printed pattern to a sheared and open cut pile surface as discussed by Sherrill et al to produce a smooth fabric surface and give the printed image a better surface.

In spite of the four-reference combination, it is submitted that the present invention incorporates limitations to the claims that are not met by the new ground of rejection. Specifically, there is nothing in these references that discloses to one skilled in the art that a border on one side is capable of masking said graphic impression that may overlap onto said border from the central area on said one side. Additionally, there is nothing in these references to suggest that the central area on said second side is capable of masking any potential bleed-through of said graphic impression from said central area of the one side.

The other rejections set forth in the Brief on Appeal and the Examiner's Answer, and have been responded to in Applicant's Brief and those responses are hereby incorporated in this Petition to Reopen Prosecution under 37 CFR 1.111.

In view of the New Ground of Rejection and the Request to Reopen Prosecution, it is noted that the Appeal is hereby withdrawn when prosecution is reopened.

Respectfully submitted,



Gregory N. Clements
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 30,713
CLEMENTS | WALKER
1901 Roxborough Road, Suite 300
Charlotte, North Carolina 28211
Telephone: 704/790-3600
Facsimile: 704/366-9744

GNC/nb

F:\WPNET\DEVANT\PATENT\3129\3129_petition_to_reopen_prosecution.doc